



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,456	10/16/2003	Hideki Kawai	Q77945	5429
23373 7590 01/24/2007 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	
3 MONTHS			01/24/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/685,456	KAWAI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Doug Hutton	2176	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6,8-10,33,34,42-44,48,50-52,75 and 76 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,11-32,35-37,45-47,49,53-60,62,65,70,72-74,78 and 79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 38-41,61,63,64,66-69,71 and 77 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Applicant's Response***

In Applicant's Response dated 10/19/2006, Applicant amended the Specification, amended the Drawings, amended Claims 1-5, 7, 11-32, 35-41, 45-47, 49, 53-74 and 77-79, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 07/20/2006.

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the objections to the Specification previously set forth are withdrawn.

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the objections to the Drawings previously set forth are withdrawn.

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the objections to the Claims previously set forth are withdrawn.

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph previously set forth are withdrawn.

Currently, Claims 1-79 are pending, and Claims 6, 8-10, 33, 34, 42-44, 48, 50-52, 75 and 76 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a nonelected invention. Thus, Claims 1-5, 7, 11-32, 35-41, 45-47, 49, 53-74 and 77-79 are substantively examined in this Office Action.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “hyperlink hyperlink s” on Page 1, Line 9 should be amended to – hyperlinks – because it appears to be a typographic error. Similar errors (e.g., “hyperlink hyperlink,” “hyperlink a hyperlink” and “hyperlink s”) occur many times throughout the Specification and must be corrected at every instance of its occurrence.
- The phrase “site of” on Page 1, Line 13 should be omitted so the sentence reads more clearly.
- The phrase “may be regarded as a normal” on Page 3, Line 12 should be amended to — may be regarded as [[a]] normal — so the sentence reads more clearly.
- The phrase “describing thereon” on Page 18, Line 20 should be omitted so the sentence reads more clearly.
- The phrase “another kind of Japanese character, description” on Page 22, Line 6 should be amended to — another kind of Japanese character, ~~description~~ — so the sentence reads more clearly.
- The phrase “may record thereon a body of the document” on Page 25, Line 14 should be amended to — may record ~~thereon a body of~~ for the document — so the sentence reads more clearly.
- The phrase “into a same group” on Page 32, Lines 16-17 should be amended to — into a ~~same~~ group — so the sentence reads more clearly. This error occurs

multiple times in the Specification and must be corrected at every instance of its occurrence.

- The phrase “which is divided in the same group” on Page 32, Lines 17-18 should be deleted so the sentence reads more clearly. This error occurs multiple times in the Specification and must be corrected at every instance of its occurrence.
- The phrase “into a same sub-group” on Page 32, Line 18 should be amended to — into a ~~same~~ sub-group — so the sentence reads more clearly. This error occurs multiple times in the Specification and must be corrected at every instance of its occurrence.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*comparing of the hyperlinks of links*” in Lines 5-6 should be amended to — comparing [[of]] the hyperlinks of links — because it appears to be a typographic error.
- The term “web” should be inserted between the terms “*target*” and “*pages*” in Line 9 because that is how the element is previously identified (see Line 6 and 7).

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term "*hypertext*" in Line 3 should be amended to —hyperlink — because that is how the element is identified in other claims (see Claim 2, Line 7). The claims should use the same terminology to identify the same elements of the present invention. If the "*hypertext*" recited in Claim 14 differs from the "*hyperlink*" recited in Claim 2, then Applicant should explain the differences in response to this Office Action.

Claims 16, 17, 26, 27, 58, 59, 68 and 69 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In Claim 16, the phrase "logically mismatched" should be inserted between the terms "*a*" and "*link*" in Line 1 because that is how the element is previously identified (see Claim 3, Line 5). Also, this amendment is needed to distinguish the "*link*" of Claim 16 from the "*stored*" links recited in Claim 3, Lines 2-3. Claims 17, 26, 27, 58, 59, 68 and 69 have the same problem.

Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The indentation at the beginning of Line 6 should be omitted in order to keep the formatting of the claim consistent.
- The term "*webpages*" in Line 9 should be amended to —web pages — because that is how the element is previously identified (see Lines 6 and 7).

Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*a second correction*” in Line 7 should be amended to — a second correction candidate — in order to keep the terminology of the claim consistent.
- The term “third” should be inserted between the terms “a” and “*correction*” in Line 10 in order to keep the terminology of the claim consistent.
- The term “fourth” should be inserted between the terms “a” and “*correction*” in Line 13 in order to keep the terminology of the claim consistent.

Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “the” should be inserted between the terms “*about*” and “*links*” in Line 5 because the element is previously identified in the claims (see Claim 4, Lines 2-3).

Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*having a link on a target website to be checked*” in Line 2 should be amended to — ~~having~~ wherein a link ~~[[on]] to~~ a target website ~~to be~~ is checked — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 37 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*having a link on a target website to be checked*” in Line 2 should be amended to — ~~having~~ wherein a link ~~[[on]] to~~ a target website ~~to be~~ is checked — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 38 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “logical” must be inserted between the terms “a” and “mismatch” in Line 4 because the “mismatches” detected by the present invention are “logical” mismatches. This is an essential part of Applicant's invention and must be included in the claim.
- The phrase “of said link” should be inserted at the end of Line 10 in order to maintain consistency in the claim limitations (see Line 11, which reads *“identification information about a target web page of said link”*).

Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “at least” should be inserted between the terms “said” and “three” in Line 2 because that is how the element is previously identified (see Claim 38, Lines 7-8).

Claim 40 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “at least” should be inserted between the terms “said” and “three” in Line 3 because that is how the element is previously identified (see Claim 38, Lines 7-8).
- The term “candidate” in Line 5 should be amended to — candidates — because three correction candidates are previously identified in the claim (see Line 3).

Claim 55 is objected to because of the following informalities:



- The phrase “*link source descriptions of a plurality of*” in Line 5 should be deleted so that the claim reads more clearly.
- The phrase “*a plurality of*” in Line 7 should be deleted so that the claim reads more clearly.
- The phrase “*having a same source web page*” in Line 10 should be amended to — having [[a]] the same source web page — in order to keep the terminology of the claims consistent

Claim 57 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*link source descriptions of a plurality of*” in Line 5 should be deleted so that the claim reads more clearly.
- The phrase “for an associated link” should be inserted after the phrase “*web page*” in Line 9 so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 64 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The indentation at the beginning of Line 2 should be omitted in order to keep the formatting of the claim consistent.
- The phrase “*a second correction*” in Line 7 should be amended to — a second correction candidate — in order to keep the terminology of the claim consistent.
- The term “third” should be inserted between the terms “a” and “*correction*” in Line 10 in order to keep the terminology of the claim consistent.

- The term "fourth" should be inserted between the terms "a" and "*correction*" in Line 13 in order to keep the terminology of the claim consistent.

Claim 67 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The indentation at the beginning of Line 2 should be omitted in order to keep the formatting of the claim consistent.

Claim 69 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The indentation at the beginning of Line 2 should be omitted in order to keep the formatting of the claim consistent.

Claim 70 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase "*any one of*" in Line 1 should be deleted because it appears to be a typographic error.

Claim 77 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term "the" should be inserted between the terms "*about*" and "*links*" in Line 5 because the element is previously identified in the claims (see Claim 4, Lines 2-3).

Claim 78 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*having a link on a target website to be checked*” in Lines 1-2 should be amended to — ~~having~~ wherein a link ~~[[on]] to~~ a target website ~~to be~~ is checked — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 79 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*having a link on a target website to be checked*” in Lines 1-2 should be amended to — ~~having~~ wherein a link ~~[[on]] to~~ a target website ~~to be~~ is checked — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-32, 35-37, 45, 53-59, 72-74 and 78 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

*Claims 1, 2 and 36:*

The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In summary, Claim 1 recites an "*apparatus*" that detects links. The recited "*apparatus*" comprises only software modules and does not comprise any type of hardware. Thus, the recited invention is computer software *per se*.

A computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer. The computer program itself is not a statutory process in that it does not include the computer-readable medium needed to realize the functionality of the computer program. Thus, as currently recited, Claim 1 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a concrete, useful and tangible result.

Claims 2 and 36 merely recite further functions of the previously recited software modules and do not recite any type of hardware. Thus, the recited invention of Claims 2 and 36 is also computer software *per se*.

Moreover, as currently recited, Claim 1 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result because the recited subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real-world value. In other words, the Claim 1 recites a result that is abstract in nature (e.g., a thought, a computation or manipulated data).

Specifically, Claim 1 provides the abstract result of *detecting a link*. This produced result remains in the abstract and thus fails to achieve the required status of having real-world value.

Claims 2 and 36 further define the abstract result of *detecting a link*. However, the further defined results remain in the abstract and thus fail to achieve the required status of having real-world value.

*Claims 3-5, 7, 11-32, 35 and 37:*

The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In summary, Claim 3 recites an "*apparatus*" that stores information and detects links. The recited "*apparatus*" comprises only software modules and does not comprise any type of hardware. Thus, the recited invention is computer software *per se*.

A computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer. The computer program itself is not a statutory process in that it does not include the computer-readable medium needed to realize the functionality of the computer program. Thus, as currently recited, Claim 3 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a concrete, useful and tangible result.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 11-32, 35 and 37 merely recite further functions of the previously recited software modules and do not recite any type of hardware. Thus, the recited invention of Claims 4, 5, 7, 11-32, 35 and 37 is also computer software *per se*.

Moreover, as currently recited, Claim 3 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result because the recited subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real-world value. In other words, the Claim 3 recites a result that is abstract in nature (e.g., a thought, a computation or manipulated data).

Specifically, Claim 3 provides the abstract results of *storing information*, without previously performing any functions associated with the information, and *detecting a link*. This produced result remains in the abstract and thus fails to achieve the required status of having real-world value.

Claims 5, 11-32, 35 and 37 merely recite *detecting a link* by monitoring conditions, manipulating data and calculating scores. None of these functions performed by the software yield a tangible result because the functions stop short of a practical application.

*Claims 45, 53-59, 72-74 and 78:*

The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 45 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result because the recited subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real-world value. In other words, the Claim 45 recites a result that is abstract in nature (e.g., a thought, a computation or manipulated data).

Specifically, Claim 45 provides the abstract results of *storing information*, without previously performing any functions associated with the information, and *detecting a link*. This produced result remains in the abstract and thus fails to achieve the required status of having real-world value.

Claims 53-59, 72-74 and 78 merely recite *detecting a link* by monitoring conditions, manipulating data and calculating scores. None of these functions performed by the software yield a tangible result because the functions stop short of a practical application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 18, 20, 28, 36, 37, 45-47, 49, 53, 54, 60, 62, 65, 70, 78 and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bates et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0133514 A1 (hereinafter, "Bates").

*Claim 1:*

Bates discloses *an apparatus for checking a link to a target hypertext databased, said apparatus detecting a logically mismatched link to said hypertext database* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses these limitations, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

*Claim 2:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 1, wherein said apparatus detects at least one of the following logically mismatched links:*

- *a link having a mismatch between the hyperlink appearing on a source web page and a target web page* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text);
- *a link having a mismatch between the hyperlink appearing on the source web page and a target web page having expired content;*
- *a link having an inconsistent hyperlink appearing on multiple web pages;*
- *a link having a different method of presenting an associated target web page than other links on the same web page in the same website;*



- *a link having a hyperlink that is not readily apparent to a user; and*
- *a link that forms a loop with other links relating to a similar topic.*

*Claim 3:*

*Bates discloses an apparatus for checking a link, comprising:*

- *an information storing unit which stores information about links (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses this limitation in that the link verifying system stores information concerning URLs); and*
- *a condition detecting unit which detects a logically mismatched link (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).*

*Claim 4:*

*Bates discloses the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 3, further comprising an information collecting unit which collects information about the links, wherein said information storing unit stores said information about the links collected by said information collecting unit (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses these limitations, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).*

*Claim 5:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 3, further comprising a candidate providing unit which provides a correction candidate related to the logically mismatched link detected by said condition detecting unit* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

*Claim 7:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 5, further comprising a correction reflecting unit which corrects the logically mismatched link* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses these limitations, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

*Claim 11:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 3, wherein said condition detecting unit divides said information about the links into groups in accordance with a predetermined condition and detects a subgroup of the groups that includes the logically mismatched link* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses these limitations in that the link verifying system stores metadata associated with URLs and uses the metadata to contextually verify the URLs. Also, the system allows the user to provide specific context terms and negative context terms that are used to contextually verify the URLs.).

*Claim 12:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 3, wherein said condition detecting unit detects a link having a mismatch between the link and a target web page* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

*Claim 18:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 5, wherein said condition detecting unit divides said information about the links into groups including a major group and a minor group in accordance with a predetermined condition and detects said minor group as including the logically mismatched link* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses these limitations in that the link verifying system stores metadata associated with URLs and uses the metadata to contextually verify the URLs. Also, the system allows the user to provide specific context terms and negative context terms that are used to contextually verify the URLs.).

*Claim 20:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 5, wherein said condition detecting unit detects a link having a mismatch between the link and a target web page* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on

Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

*Claim 28:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 4, wherein said information collecting unit repeatedly collects said information about the links, and said information storing unit stores said information collected at different times* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses these limitations in that the link verifying system collects metadata associated with URLs and allows the user to provide specific context terms and negative context terms at various times and stores the information for later use in contextually verifying the URLs).

*Claim 36:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 1, having a link on a target website to be checked* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053 and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses these limitations, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

*Claim 37:*

Bates discloses *the apparatus for checking the link as set forth in Claim 3, having a link on a target website to be checked* (see Figures 1-5; see Paragraphs 0001-0053

Art Unit: 2176

and all claims on Pages 5-8 → Bates discloses these limitations, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text).

*Claims 45 and 46:*

The claims merely recite computer software for performing the same method performed by the “apparatus” of Claim 3. Thus, Bates discloses every limitation of Claims 45 and 46, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 3.

*Claims 47, 49, 53, 54, 60, 62, 65, 70, 78 and 79:*

Claims 47, 49, 53, 54, 60, 62, 65, 70, 78 and 79 merely recite computer software for performing the same methods performed by the “apparatus” of Claims 5, 7, 11, 12, 18, 20, 23, 28, 36 and 37, respectively. Thus, Bates discloses every limitation of Claims 47, 49, 53, 54, 60, 62, 65, 70, 78 and 79, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 5, 7, 11, 12, 18, 20, 23, 28, 36 and 37.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14, 23 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates, in view of Carswell et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065720 A1 (hereinafter, Carswell).

*Claim 14:*

As indicated in the above rejection, Bates discloses every limitation of Claim 3.

Bates fails to expressly disclose:

- *detecting a link having a mismatch between the hypertext appearing on a source web page and a target web page **having expired content**.*

Carswell teaches an apparatus for checking a link, comprising:

- *a condition detecting unit [that] detects a link having a mismatch between the hypertext appearing on a source web page and a target web page having expired content* (see Page 7, Paragraphs 0098-0100 → Carswell teaches this limitation in that the online promotion system periodically contacts web servers to remove expired promotions data and replace it with new promotions data),  
for the purpose of issuing online promotions such as coupons over public computer networks (see Page 1, Paragraph 0008).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus, disclosed in Bates, to include:

- *detecting a link having a mismatch between the hypertext appearing on a source web page and a target web page **having expired content**,*

for the purpose of issuing online promotions such as coupons over public computer networks, as taught in Carswell.

*Claim 23 and 56:*

The claims correspond to the subject matter recited in Claim 14. Thus, Bates, in view of Carswell, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claims 23 and 56, and provides proper motivation, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 14.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 38-41 include allowable subject matter. However, all objections to the claims must be obviated before the claims are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

*Claim 38:*

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest the combination of limitations recited in the claim.

Art Unit: 2176

*Claims 39-41:*

These claims are dependent upon Claim 38 and are thus allowable.

Claims 13, 15-17, 19, 21, 22, 24-27, 29-32, 35, 55, 57-59, 61, 63, 64, 66-69, 71-74 and 77 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also, all objections to and rejections for the claims must be obviated before the claims are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

*Claims 13, 15-17, 19, 21, 22, 24-27, 29-32, 35, 55, 57-59, 61, 63, 64, 66-69, 71-74 and 77:*

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest the combination of limitations recited in the claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is 571-272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone



Art Unit: 2176

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH

January 22, 2007



**Doug Hutton**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Technology Center 2100**